

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
CRAVE II DELIVERY ORDER
CONTRACT TYPE, EVALUATION CRITERIA, & BASIS FOR AWARD**

DO Number and Title: Flight Crew Operations Computer/Web based Trainer for Training Processes

DO Type: ☒ Cost Plus Fixed Fee (CPFF) ☐ Firm Fixed Price (FFP) – Note: Full funding must be obligated on PR

Contract Type

☒ Competitive ☐ Justification for an Exception to Fair Opportunity (Attach CO approved justification per FAR 16.505)

Independent Government Estimate (IGE) Range (A completed IGE Template must be available (NASA only) to support the range checked)									
Delivery Order	<\$50k	\$50k-\$100k	\$100k-\$250k	\$250k – \$500k	\$500k – \$1M	\$1M – \$1.5M	\$1.5 M – \$2.0M	\$2M – \$2.5M	Free Form Range
Basic	x								
Option 1	x								
Option 2	x								
Option 3	x								
Option 4	x								
Option 5	x								

Basis for Award & Evaluation Criteria

This **Criteria for Award** for this DO is identified in Table 1.

Table 1 - Criteria for Award		
Criteria #	Selected	Tradeoff
1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tradeoffs will be made based on the Technical Approach. The Technical Approach is significantly more important than Past Performance and Cost/Price.
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tradeoffs will be made between Past Performance and Cost/Price. Past Performance and Cost/Price are considered to be of equal value.
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tradeoffs will be made between Past Performance and Cost/Price. Cost/Price is considerably more important than Past Performance.
4	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tradeoffs will be made between Past Performance and Cost/Price. Past Performance is significantly more important than Cost/Price.
5	<input type="checkbox"/>	Lowest Price, Technically Acceptable (Usually for FFP)

Awards based on Criteria 1

An award based on this criteria is intended to award the DO based on a proposal that represents the greatest benefit to the Government based upon the Offeror's technical approach, past performance, and cost/price proposal.

Awards based on Criteria 2-4

Awards based on Criteria 2-4 are based only on Past Performance and Cost/Price.

Awards based on Criteria 5

The Lowest Price option will be covered by selecting Criteria 5, **providing that the Technical Proposals are considered acceptable**. A technical acceptable proposal is one that is considered fully responsive to the Technical Requirements established in the DO.

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
CRAVE II DELIVERY ORDER
CONTRACT TYPE, EVALUATION CRITERIA, & BASIS FOR AWARD**

After review of each Contractor's proposal, and any necessary discussions, the Contracting Officer may issue a DO based on the Criteria identified above. Multiple awards for the same Delivery Order are possible. Further information on these criteria and award factors is provided below.

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
CRAVE II DELIVERY ORDER
CONTRACT TYPE, EVALUATION CRITERIA, & BASIS FOR AWARD**

Technical Approach

A Technical evaluation is not required on FFP contracts awarded using Criteria 5 (Lowest Price, Technically Acceptable).

Each of the proposals will be adjectively scored using the criteria in Table 2.

A Technical Evaluation will be performed on all Crave IDIQ proposals received to determine their respective Strengths and Weaknesses (S&W) based on the Offeror's:

1. Demonstrated understanding of the work. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's technical response for overall demonstrated, comprehensive understanding, effectiveness, soundness, feasibility, efficiency and consistency of its proposed approach.
2. Identification and proposed resolution of any potential problems or identified risks likely to be encountered during DO performance.
3. Understanding of the technologies involved in performing the work.
4. Application of new techniques, methods, or materials or innovative approaches to optimize product performance.
5. Ability to deliver the products in accordance with the established milestone schedule.

These S&Ws will be used to assign an adjective score as defined below:

Table 2 – Technical Evaluation Ratings	
Adjective	Definition
Excellent	A comprehensive and thorough proposal of exceptional merit with one or more strengths. No weaknesses exist.
Very Good	A proposal having no weaknesses and which demonstrates over-all competence. One or more strengths have been found, and strengths outbalance any weaknesses that exist.
Good	A proposal which shows a reasonably sound response. There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both. As a whole, weaknesses not off-set by strengths do not significantly detract from the offeror's response.
Fair	A proposal which has one or more weaknesses. Weaknesses outbalance any strengths.
Poor	A proposal that has weaknesses that demonstrate a lack of overall competence or would require a major proposal revision to correct.

Past Performance

Past Performance evaluations are not required on FFP contracts awarded using Criteria 5 (Lowest Price, Technically Acceptable).

Past performance (including performance on previous CRAVE DOs) will be taken into consideration during DO competitions and will be evaluated and adjectively scored as follows:

Very High Level of Confidence	The Offeror's relevant past performance is of exceptional merit and is very highly pertinent to this acquisition; indicating exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner; very minor (if any) problems with no adverse effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
High Level of Confidence	The Offeror's relevant past performance is highly pertinent to this acquisition; demonstrating very effective performance that would be fully responsive to contract requirements with contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part with only minor problems with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
CRAVE II DELIVERY ORDER
CONTRACT TYPE, EVALUATION CRITERIA, & BASIS FOR AWARD**

	the Offeror's performance record, there is a high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Moderate Level of Confidence	The Offeror's relevant past performance is pertinent to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Low Level of Confidence	The Offeror's relevant past performance is at least somewhat pertinent to this acquisition, and it meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements.
Very Low Level of Confidence	The Offeror's relevant past performance does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas which adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Neutral	In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance [see FAR 15.305(a) (2) (ii) and (iv)].

Cost/Price

For the FFP option, the price evaluation is based on the total amount of the Base plus all options. For FFP using Criteria 5, no cost evaluations are required as described below.

Cost/Price will not be scored. If it is a cost type contract, a cost realism assessment will be performed to determine what the Government would realistically expect to pay for the proposed effort, based on the offeror's understanding of the work, and the offeror's ability to perform the contract.

Rationale must be provided for any proposed material and travel in accordance with the contract.